

Introduction to Machine Learning

丁尧相

浙江大学

Slides link:

<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>



Summer 2023
Lecture 8

To Achieve Higher-Level AI

- Background
- Learning from small data
- Learning to model the world
- Joint learning of perception and reasoning
- Take-home messages

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

To Achieve Higher-Level AI

- Background
- Learning from small data
- Learning to model the world
- Joint learning of perception and reasoning
- Take-home messages

Slides link:




<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Artificial Intelligence

“Definitions demand reduction and reduction demands going to a lower rung.”

— Judea Pearl, “The book of why”.



Turing Test

“The new form of game can be described in terms of a game which we call the ‘imitation game’”.

“Instead of trying to produce a programme to simulate the adult mind, why not rather try to produce one which simulates the child’s?”

— Alan Turing, “Computing Machinery and Intelligence”, 1950.



Turing Test

“The new form of game can be described in terms of a game which we call the ‘imitation game’”.

“Instead of trying to produce a programme to simulate the adult mind, why not rather try to produce one which simulates the child’s?”

— Alan Turing, “Computing Machinery and Intelligence”, 1950.



What is still missing
in the current AI systems?

Missing from Current ML: Understanding & Generalization - Beyond the Training Distribution


- Learning theory only deals with generalization within the same distribution
- Models learn but do not generalize well (or have high sample complexity when adapting) to modified distributions, non-stationarities, etc.
- ***Humans do a lot better!!!***

SYSTEM 1 VS. SYSTEM 2 COGNITION

2 systems (and categories of cognitive tasks):

System 1

- Intuitive, fast, **UNCONSCIOUS**, 1-step parallel, non-linguistic, habitual
- Implicit knowledge
- Current DL



System 2

- Slow, logical, **sequential**, **CONSCIOUS**, linguistic, algorithmic, planning, reasoning
- Explicit knowledge
- DL 2.0




Manipulates high-level / semantic concepts, which can be recombined combinatorially

SYSTEM 1 VS. SYSTEM 2 COGNITION

2 systems (and categories of cognitive tasks):

System 1

- Intuitive, fast, **UNCONSCIOUS**, 1-step parallel, non-linguistic, habitual
- Implicit knowledge
- Current DL



System 2


- Slow, logical, **sequential**, **CONSCIOUS**, linguistic, algorithmic, planning, reasoning
- Explicit knowledge
- DL 2.0



6

Manipulates high-level / semantic concepts, which can be recombined combinatorially

Model of the Environment




To make decisions in the environment, the agent usually needs a model of the environment to know how the things go on.

Where does this model come from?


Given by the problem (external) or built by the agent? (internal)

Internal vs. External Model


A decision-making agent can make use of external model when available, or build its own internal model when unavailable.





World Model, External Policy & Internal Policy



World Model, External Policy & Internal Policy







To Achieve Higher-Level AI

- Learning from small data: fast learning ability from few sample.
- Learning to model the world: the foundation of OOD generalization ability is the ability to “imagine” new things.
- Joint learning of perception and reasoning: learning both low-level and high-level knowledge from data: more powerful internal model.



What is still missing
in the current AI systems?

To Achieve Higher-Level AI

- Background
- Learning from small data
- Joint learning of perception and reasoning
- Learning to model, simulate, and act
- Take-home messages

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Meta-Learning

- Background
- Learning Algorithms
 - Methodologies
 - Optimization-Based Approaches
 - Non-Parametric Approaches
 - Black-Box Approaches

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Meta-Learning

- Background
- Learning Algorithms
 - Methodologies
 - Optimization-Based Approaches
 - Non-Parametric Approaches
 - Black-Box Approaches

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Background

Machine learning success usually rely on massive data

Large, diverse data
(+ large models)



Broad generalization



Background

Machine learning success usually rely on massive data

Large, diverse data
(+ large models)



Broad generalization



What if you don't have a large dataset?

medical imaging

robotics

personalized education,
recommendations


translation for rare languages

Learning from Small Data

We mean a learning task to be a given $P(x, y)$

Suppose we want to solve a learning task:

- All classes are rare classes on the tail.
- Training data for each class is small.




Learning from Small Data

We mean a learning task to be a given $P(x, y)$

Suppose we want to solve a learning task:

- All classes are **rare classes on the tail**.
- Training data for each class is small.




- Can we expect to learn a good classifier from scratch?
Perhaps not. Training data is not sufficient.

Learning from Small Data

We mean a learning task to be a given $P(x, y)$

Suppose we want to solve a learning task:

- All classes are **rare classes on the tail**.
- Training data for each class is small.




- Can we expect to learn a good classifier from scratch?
Perhaps not. Training data is not sufficient.
- Can we expect to utilize a model from a previous task?
May not be good when the current tail classes never appeared before.

Learning from Small Data

We mean a learning task to be a given $P(x, y)$

Suppose we want to solve a learning task:

- All classes are **rare classes on the tail**.
- Training data for each class is small.



- Can we expect to learn a good classifier from scratch?
Perhaps not. Training data is not sufficient.
- Can we expect to utilize a model from a previous task?
May not be good when the current tail classes never appeared before.

How can we learn good classifiers from small training data?
We have to reduce the dependence on data!

The Power of Inductive Bias

- To reduce the dependence on data, a correct *prior* is necessary.

$$P(\phi|D) \propto \underline{P(\phi)} P(D|\phi)$$

What is a good learning algorithm?
Inductive bias plus data-modeling mechanism

The Power of Inductive Bias

- To reduce the dependence on data, a correct *prior* is necessary.

$$P(\phi|D) \propto \underline{P(\phi)} P(D|\phi)$$

What is a good learning algorithm?
Inductive bias plus data-modeling mechanism

Where to obtain the good inductive bias (prior)?

Modeling image formation

Geometry

SIFT features, HOG features + SVM

Fine-tuning from ImageNet features

Domain adaptation from other painters

???

Fewer human priors,
more data-driven priors

Greater success.

Learning to Learn by Meta-Learning

Meta-learning is learning-to-learn:
Learn a inductive bias from previous learning experiences.

Learning to Learn by Meta-Learning

Meta-learning is learning-to-learn:
Learn a inductive bias from previous learning experiences.

- The objective is to solve new learning tasks with the learned inductive bias efficiently.

Learning to Learn by Meta-Learning

Meta-learning is learning-to-learn:
Learn a inductive bias from previous learning experiences.

- The objective is to solve new learning tasks with the learned inductive bias efficiently.
- For out tail classification problems, we expect to learn a good prior by solving many learning tasks during meta-training, in order to solve a new learning task during meta-testing.

Learning to Learn by Meta-Learning


Meta-learning is learning-to-learn:
Learn a inductive bias from previous learning experiences.

- The objective is to solve new learning tasks with the learned inductive bias efficiently.
- For out tail classification problems, we expect to learn a good prior by solving many learning tasks during meta-training, in order to solve a new learning task during meta-testing.

How to achieve this?
Learn a good model initialization?
Learn a good feature representation?

A Normal Learning Task

- Training data: $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$
input (e.g., image) label
- Learning objective:




$$\arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\mathcal{D}|\phi)$$

If data is sufficient, we can totally ignore the prior and fully learn from data.

A Meta-Learning Task

- **Meta-train data(sets):** $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$ \mathcal{D}_1
 $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \dots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$ \mathcal{D}_2
⋮



A Meta-Learning Task

- **Meta-train data(sets):** $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$ \mathcal{D}_1
 $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \dots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$ \mathcal{D}_2
⋮ ⋮
- The meta-learning algorithm learns the prior: $p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$

A Meta-Learning Task

- **Meta-train data(sets):**

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \dots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$$

 \mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 \vdots 

- The meta-learning algorithm learns the prior: $p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$
- The final target is to solve a new learning task:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$$


input (e.g., image) label



$$\arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$$

A Meta-Learning Task

- **Meta-train data(sets):** $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$ \mathcal{D}_1
 $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \dots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$ \mathcal{D}_2
⋮
⋮
- The meta-learning algorithm learns the prior: $p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$
- The final target is to solve a new learning task:



$$\arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$$

$$= \arg \max_{\phi} \log \{\mathbb{E}_{\phi_0} [p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \phi_0) p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})]\}$$

A Meta-Learning Task

- **Meta-train data(sets):** $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$ \mathcal{D}_1
 $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \dots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$ \mathcal{D}_2
 \vdots \vdots

- The meta-learning algorithm learns the prior: $p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$
- The final target is to solve a new learning task:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$$


 input (e.g., image) label

$$\arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$$

 $= \arg \max_{\phi} \log \{\mathbb{E}_{\phi_0} [p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \phi_0) p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})]\} \approx \arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \phi_0)$

A Meta-Learning Task

- **Meta-train data(sets):** $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$ \mathcal{D}_1
 $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \dots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$ \mathcal{D}_2
 \vdots \vdots

- The meta-learning algorithm learns the prior: $p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$
- The final target is to solve a new learning task:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)\}$$


 input (e.g., image) label

$$\arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$$

 $= \arg \max_{\phi} \log \{\mathbb{E}_{\phi_0} [p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \phi_0) p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})]\} \approx \arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \phi_0)$


Augment training data with meta-train data through a learned prior

A Meta-Learning Task

- **Meta-train data(sets):** $\mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}} = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n\}$ \mathcal{D}_1
 $\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_1^i, y_1^i), \dots, (x_k^i, y_k^i)\}$ \mathcal{D}_2
⋮



- The meta-learning algorithm learns the prior: $p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$
- The final target is to solve a new learning task:



$$\arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})$$

$$= \arg \max_{\phi} \log \{ \mathbb{E}_{\phi_0} [p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \phi_0) p(\phi_0 | \mathcal{D}_{\text{meta-train}})] \} \approx \arg \max_{\phi} \log p(\phi | \mathcal{D}, \phi_0)$$

Augment

Why prior from meta-train data can help?
Are there any further assumptions?

Learned prior

Mathematical Formulation

- There is a **task distribution** \mathcal{T} , such that any data distribution that defines a learning task is a sample from it: $P(x, y) \sim \mathcal{T}$.

Mathematical Formulation

- There is a **task distribution** \mathcal{T} , such that any data distribution that defines a learning task is a sample from it: $P(x, y) \sim \mathcal{T}$.
- Any dataset is generated by sample $P \sim \mathcal{T}$, and then sample $\mathcal{D} \sim P$

Mathematical Formulation

- There is a **task distribution** \mathcal{T} , such that any data distribution that defines a learning task is a sample from it: $P(x, y) \sim \mathcal{T}$.
- Any dataset is generated by sample $P \sim \mathcal{T}$, and then sample $\mathcal{D} \sim P$

What is a task distribution? This is maybe the trickiest thing in meta-learning.
After all, it defines the relationship among learning tasks.

Mathematical Formulation

- There is a **task distribution** \mathcal{T} , such that any data distribution that defines a learning task is a sample from it: $P(x, y) \sim \mathcal{T}$.
- Any dataset is generated by sample $P \sim \mathcal{T}$, and then sample $\mathcal{D} \sim P$

What is a task distribution? This is maybe the trickiest thing in meta-learning.
After all, it defines the relationship among learning tasks.

- Given any dataset \mathcal{D} and prior ϕ_0 , a learning algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0)$ exists to output ϕ .

Mathematical Formulation

- There is a **task distribution** \mathcal{T} , such that any data distribution that defines a learning task is a sample from it: $P(x, y) \sim \mathcal{T}$.
- Any dataset is generated by sample $P \sim \mathcal{T}$, and then sample $\mathcal{D} \sim P$

What is a task distribution? This is maybe the trickiest thing in meta-learning.
After all, it defines the relationship among learning tasks.

- Given any dataset \mathcal{D} and prior ϕ_0 , a learning algorithm $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0)$ exists to output ϕ .
- The meta-learning objective is to learn prior ϕ_0 to minimize the **transfer risk**:

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

The Meta-Learning Procedure

- The formulation of transfer risk exactly shows how to train ϕ_0

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

The Meta-Learning Procedure

- The formulation of transfer risk exactly shows how to train ϕ_0

$$\arg \min_{\underline{\phi_0}} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \underline{\phi_0}), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- Meta-train is a bi-level optimization problem:
 - Sample a task P to obtain inner train and test data $\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \mathcal{D}^{ts}$
 - Do **inner optimization** $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \phi_0)$ to obtain ϕ
 - Do **inner test** for ϕ on \mathcal{D}^{ts} to obtain $L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \phi_0), \mathcal{D}^{ts})$
 - Do **outer optimization** on $L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \phi_0), \mathcal{D}^{ts})$ to update ϕ_0

The Meta-Learning Procedure

- The formulation of transfer risk exactly shows how to train ϕ_0

$$\arg \min_{\underline{\phi_0}} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \underline{\phi_0}), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- Meta-train is a bi-level optimization problem:
 - Sample a task P to obtain inner train and test data $\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \mathcal{D}^{ts}$
 - Do **inner optimization** $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \phi_0)$ to obtain ϕ
 - Do **inner test** for ϕ on \mathcal{D}^{ts} to obtain $L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \phi_0), \mathcal{D}^{ts})$
 - Do **outer optimization** on $L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \phi_0), \mathcal{D}^{ts})$ to update ϕ_0

Inner optimization $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}^{tr}, \phi_0)$ is usually assumed to have very low cost.
This shows that we can adapt to new task very fast using very few data.

Meta vs. Transfer and Multi-Task Learning

- Meta-learning includes inner update — inner test — outer update

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- It encodes **the procedure** of learning-to-learn:

tries to learn — test the performance — improve learning skill

Meta vs. Transfer and Multi-Task Learning

- Meta-learning includes inner update — inner test — outer update

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- It encodes **the procedure** of learning-to-learn:

tries to learn — test the performance — improve learning skill

- Different from multi-task learning (learn model to solve multiple tasks simultaneously) and transfer learning (a more general notion):

Meta vs. Transfer and Multi-Task Learning

- Meta-learning includes inner update — inner test — outer update

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- It encodes **the procedure** of learning-to-learn:

tries to learn — test the performance — improve learning skill

- Different from multi-task learning (learn model to solve multiple tasks simultaneously) and transfer learning (a more general notion):
 - Meta-learning solves **future tasks** instead of existing ones.

Meta vs. Transfer and Multi-Task Learning

- Meta-learning includes inner update — inner test — outer update

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- It encodes **the procedure** of learning-to-learn:

tries to learn — test the performance — improve learning skill

- Different from multi-task learning (learn model to solve multiple tasks simultaneously) and transfer learning (a more general notion):
 - Meta-learning solves **future tasks** instead of existing ones.
 - Meta-learning assumes that **no single model can solve all tasks**. Thus it learns **how-to-learn** instead of training a single model.

Meta vs. Transfer and Multi-Task Learning

- Meta-learning includes inner update — inner test — outer update

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- It encodes **the procedure** of learning-to-learn:

tries to learn — test the performance — improve learning skill

- Different from multi-task learning (learn model to solve multiple tasks simultaneously) and transfer learning (a more general notion):
 - Meta-learning solves **future tasks** instead of existing ones.
 - Meta-learning assumes that **no single model can solve all tasks**. Thus it learns **how-to-learn** instead of training a single model.
 - Meta-learning knows **how future tasks is to be learned**.

Few-Shot Learning Protocol

- We say *K-way N-shot learning* to mean that:
 - All learning tasks are **K-class** classification problems.
 - For a single task, each class is given N training instances.

Few-Shot Learning Protocol

- We say *K-way N-shot learning* to mean that:
 - All learning tasks are **K-class** classification problems.
 - For a single task, each class is given **N** training instances.

How to *evaluate* a meta-learning algorithm

5-way, 1-shot image classification (Minilmagenet)

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$


Few-Shot Learning Protocol

- We say *K-way N-shot learning* to mean that:
 - All learning tasks are **K-class** classification problems.
 - For a single task, each class is given **N** training instances.

How to *evaluate* a meta-learning algorithm

5-way, 1-shot image classification (Minilmagenet)

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$




Few-Shot Learning Protocol

- We say *K-way N-shot learning* to mean that:
 - All learning tasks are **K-class** classification problems.
 - For a single task, each class is given **N** training instances.

How to *evaluate* a meta-learning algorithm

5-way, 1-shot image classification (Minilmagenet)

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$



Meta-Learning

- Background
- Learning Algorithms
 - Methodologies
 - Optimization-Based Approaches
 - Non-Parametric Approaches
 - Black-Box Approaches

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

How to Write a Meta-Learning Paper?

- First, you select a title: Learning to (**do the inner task**)
 - e.g. learning to **learn**: $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} \left[L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y)) \right] \right\}$

How to Write a Meta-Learning Paper?

- First, you select a title: Learning to (**do the inner task**)
 - e.g. learning to **learn**: $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} \left[L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y)) \right] \right\}$
- Then, you input A, B, C, D to the following sentence:

Given (A), use (B) and do (C), to achieve (D)

How to Write a Meta-Learning Paper?

- First, you select a title: Learning to (do the inner task)
 - e.g. learning to learn: $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$
- Then, you input A, B, C, D to the following sentence:

Given (A), use (B) and do (C), to achieve (D)

- A: The training input to the inner task.
- B: The prior you want to learn.
- C: The inner optimization algorithm you want to use.
- D: The inner test objective you want to achieve.

How to Write a Meta-Learning Paper?

- First, you select a title: Learning to (**do the inner task**)
 - e.g. learning to **learn**: $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$
- Then, you input A, B, C, D to the following sentence:

Given (A), use (B) and do (C), to achieve (D)

- A:**The training input** to the inner task.
- B:**The prior** you want to learn.
- C:**The inner optimization algorithm** you want to use.
- D:**The inner test objective** you want to achieve.
- Finally, you write down a bi-level optimization problem to learn B:
$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

How to Write a Meta-Learning Paper?

Key idea:

“our training procedure is based on a simple machine learning principle: test and train conditions must match”

Vinyals et al., Matching Networks for One-Shot Learning

You simulate the testing situation during testing, through inner update.

- Then, you input A, B, C, D to the following sentence:

Given (A), use (B) and do (C), to achieve (D)

- A: The **training input** to the inner task.
- B: The **prior** you want to learn.
- C: The **inner optimization algorithm** you want to use.
- D: The **inner test objective** you want to achieve.
- Finally, you write down a bi-level optimization problem to learn B:

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

Prior in Few-Shot Learning

- What to learn as the prior? $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$

This is related to the choice of inner update algorithm

Prior in Few-Shot Learning

- What to learn as the prior? $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$

This is related to the choice of inner update algorithm

- \mathcal{A} can be several gradient updates of the model using \mathcal{D} . Then can be an initialization of the model. — Optimization View

Prior in Few-Shot Learning

- What to learn as the prior? $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$

This is related to the choice of inner update algorithm

- \mathcal{A} can be several gradient updates of the model using \mathcal{D} . Then ϕ_0 can be an initialization of the model. — Optimization View
- \mathcal{A} can be a nearest neighbor classifier using \mathcal{D} . Then ϕ_0 can be a good feature mapping. — Nonparametric View

Prior in Few-Shot Learning

- What to learn as the prior? $\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$

This is related to the choice of inner update algorithm

- \mathcal{A} can be several gradient updates of the model using \mathcal{D} . Then ϕ_0 can be an initialization of the model. — Optimization View
- \mathcal{A} can be a nearest neighbor classifier using \mathcal{D} . Then ϕ_0 can be a good feature mapping. — Nonparametric View
- \mathcal{A} can be a direct mapping from \mathcal{D} to task classifier weights. Then ϕ_0 can be a network weight generator. — Black-Box View

Meta-Learning

- Background
- Learning Algorithms
 - Methodologies
 - Optimization-Based Approaches
 - Non-Parametric Approaches
 - Black-Box Approaches

Slides link:




<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Optimization-Based Meta-Learning

θ parameter vector
being meta-learned

ϕ_i^* optimal parameter
vector for task i



Learn a good model initialization, such that for a new task, the target classifier can be learned within a few gradient steps.


Model Agnostic Meta-Learning

Finn et. al. MAML

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$



$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{\text{task } i} \mathcal{L}(\theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}), \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{ts}})$$




Inner Task:

Given few-shot training data, use the model initialization, do a few gradient update to achieve small error on testing data.


Model Agnostic Meta-Learning

Finn et. al. MAML

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, D \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(D, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$



$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{\text{task } i} \mathcal{L}(\theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}), \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{ts}})$$




1. Sample task \mathcal{T}_i (*or mini batch of tasks*)
2. Sample disjoint datasets $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{test}}$ from \mathcal{D}_i
3. Optimize $\phi_i \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}})$
4. Update θ using $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{test}})$




Model Agnostic Meta-Learning

Finn et. al. MAML

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, D \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(D, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$



$$\min_{\theta} \sum_{\text{task } i} \mathcal{L}(\theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}), \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{ts}})$$



1. Sample task \mathcal{T}_i (*or mini batch of tasks*)
2. Sample disjoint datasets $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{test}}$ from \mathcal{D}_i
3. Optimize $\phi_i \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}})$
4. Update θ using $\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{test}})$

- ✓ Free to choose **model and loss**. Easy to apply on different tasks (e.g. reinforcement learning)
- ▀ Hard to tune. Not work well on large networks.

Meta-Learning


- Background
- Learning Algorithms
 - Methodologies
 - Optimization-Based Approaches
 - Non-Parametric Approaches
 - Black-Box Approaches

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>


Non-Parametric Meta-Learning



Learn a good feature representation, such that for a new task, the classifier is the nearest neighbor classifier constructed from the few-shot training data.

Prototypical Network

Snell et. al. Prototypical Network.



(a) Few-shot

$$\mathbf{c}_k = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}|} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}} f_\theta(x)$$

$$p_\theta(y = k|x) = \frac{\exp(-d(f_\theta(x), \mathbf{c}_k))}{\sum_{k'} \exp(-d(f_\theta(x), \mathbf{c}_{k'}))}$$


d: Euclidean, or cosine distance

```
for k in {1, ..., N_C} do
inner testing data  for (x, y) in Q_k do
                    J ← J +  $\frac{1}{N_C N_Q} \left[ d(f_\phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_k) + \log \sum_{k'} \exp(-d(f_\phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{c}_{k'})) \right]$ 
    end for
```

Inner Task:

Given few-shot training data, use the feature mapping to construct the prototypes (class center), do KNN to achieve small error on testing data.

Non-Parametric Meta-Learning



$$\mathbf{c}_k = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}|} \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{tr}}} f_\theta(x)$$

$$p_\theta(y = k|x) = \frac{\exp(-d(f_\theta(x), \mathbf{c}_k))}{\sum_{k'} \exp(-d(f_\theta(x), \mathbf{c}_{k'}))}$$

d: Euclidean, or cosine distance

✓ Easy to tune, capable to use large networks.

■ Design for few-shot learning tasks only.

Meta-Learning


- Background
- Learning Algorithms
 - Methodologies
 - Optimization-Based Approaches
 - Non-Parametric Approaches
 - Black-Box Approaches

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>


Black-Box Meta-Learning



Learn a network weight generator, such that for a new task, the classifier is directly constructed by the generator.

Black-Box Meta-Learning

Santoro et. al. MANN, Munkhdalai & Yu, Meta-Network




Inner Task:

Given few-shot training data, use the weight generator, do classifier generation to achieve small error on testing data.

Black-Box Meta-Learning

Santoro et. al. MANN, Munkhdalai & Yu, Meta-Network



Inner Task:

Given few-shot training data, use the weight generator, do classifier generation to achieve small error on testing data.

- ✓ Strong representation power. May be applied on complex tasks.
- ▬ Seems to be an unnecessary solution for few-shot tasks.

Performance Comparisons

A CLOSER LOOK AT FEW-SHOT CLASSIFICATION

Wei-Yu Chen

Carnegie Mellon University

weiyuc@andrew.cmu.edu

Yen-Cheng Liu & Zsolt Kira

Georgia Tech

{ycliu,zkira}@gatech.edu

Yu-Chiang Frank Wang

National Taiwan University

ycwang@ntu.edu.tw

Jia-Bin Huang

Virginia Tech

jbhuang@vt.edu

Method	CUB		<i>mini</i> -ImageNet	
	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot
Baseline	47.12 ± 0.74	64.16 ± 0.71	42.11 ± 0.71	62.53 ± 0.69
Baseline++	60.53 ± 0.83	79.34 ± 0.61	48.24 ± 0.75	66.43 ± 0.63
MatchingNet Vinyals et al. (2016)	61.16 ± 0.89	72.86 ± 0.70	48.14 ± 0.78	63.48 ± 0.66
ProtoNet Snell et al. (2017)	51.31 ± 0.91	70.77 ± 0.69	44.42 ± 0.84	64.24 ± 0.72
MAML Finn et al. (2017)	55.92 ± 0.95	72.09 ± 0.76	46.47 ± 0.82	62.71 ± 0.71
RelationNet Sung et al. (2018)	62.45 ± 0.98	76.11 ± 0.69	49.31 ± 0.85	66.60 ± 0.69

Performance Comparisons

REVISITING FINE-TUNING FOR FEW-SHOT LEARNING

Akihiro Nakamura

The University of Tokyo

nakamura@mi.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Tatsuya Harada

The University of Tokyo, RIKEN

harada@mi.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

	Low-resolution Single-domain		High-resolution Single-domain		Cross-domain
	1-shot	5-shot	1-shot	5-shot	5-shot
Fine-tune (Ours)	54.90 ± 0.66	74.50 ± 0.50	60.88 ± 0.71	79.82 ± 0.49	74.88 ± 0.58
Baseline (Chen et al., 2019)	42.11 ± 0.71	62.53 ± 0.69	$52.37 \pm 0.79^\ddagger$	$74.69 \pm 0.64^\ddagger$	$65.57 \pm 0.70^\ddagger$
Baseline++ (Chen et al., 2019)	48.24 ± 0.75	66.43 ± 0.63	$53.97 \pm 0.79^\ddagger$	$75.90 \pm 0.61^\ddagger$	$62.04 \pm 0.76^\ddagger$
MatchingNet (Vinyals et al., 2016)	46.6	60.0	$54.49 \pm 0.81^\ddagger$	$68.88 \pm 0.69^\ddagger$	$53.07 \pm 0.74^\ddagger$
ProtoNet (Snell et al., 2017)	49.42 ± 0.78	68.20 ± 0.66	$54.16 \pm 0.82^\ddagger$	$74.65 \pm 0.64^\ddagger$	$62.02 \pm 0.70^\ddagger$
MAML (Finn et al., 2017)	48.70 ± 1.75	63.15 ± 0.91	$54.69 \pm 0.89^\ddagger$	$66.62 \pm 0.83^\ddagger$	$51.34 \pm 0.72^\ddagger$
RelationNet (Sung et al., 2018)	50.44 ± 0.82	65.32 ± 0.70	$53.48 \pm 0.86^\ddagger$	$70.20 \pm 0.66^\ddagger$	$57.71 \pm 0.73^\ddagger$
MTL (Sun et al., 2019)	61.2 ± 1.8	75.5 ± 0.8	-	-	-
Delta Encoder (Schwartz et al., 2018)	59.9	69.7	-	-	-

To Achieve Higher-Level AI


- Background
- Learning from small data
- **Learning to model the world**
- Joint learning of perception and reasoning
- Take-home messages

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Generative Models



Discriminative Model:
Learn a probability distribution $p(y|x)$


Cat image is [CC0 public domain](#)

Dog image is CC0 Public Domain


Monkey image is CC0 Public Domain

Abstract image is free to use under the [Pixabay license](#)

Generative Models



Discriminative Model:
Learn a probability distribution $p(y|x)$



Generative model: All possible images compete with each other for probability mass

Generative Model:
Learn a probability distribution $p(x)$

Cat image is [CC0 public domain](#)


Dog image is CC0 Public Domain

Monkey image is CC0 Public Domain

Abstract image is free to use under the [Pixabay license](#)

Autoencoder


- An autoencoder consists of both an encoder and a decoder:



Input Data


Autoencoder

- An autoencoder consists of both an encoder and a decoder:
 - Encoder: transform input x into latent representation z




Autoencoder

- An autoencoder consists of both an encoder and a decoder:
 - Encoder: transform input x into latent representation z
 - Decoder: generate recovered input \hat{x} from z




Autoencoder

- An autoencoder consists of both an encoder and a decoder:
 - Encoder: transform input x into latent representation z
 - Decoder: generate recovered input \hat{x} from z



The targets are two-fold:
learn good encoder to compress the information
learn good decoder to recover the information


Vanilla Autoencoder




- Use NNs (Conv, MLP) to model encoder and decoder.
- Key: the dimension of z should be small for compressing information: ensure to learn useful information.
- Train with MSE loss (input-output gap) : $\|\hat{x} - x\|_2^2$

Learned Result


Recover from original



Recover from noisy (should also train with noisy data)



Variational Autoencoder



Why we need a model to recover the input?
Usually, we focus on learning a good encoder:
obtain good representation of data.

Vanilla AEs are not enough. We need better modeling of the generation process.

Variational Autoencoder

Probabilistic spin on autoencoders:

1. Learn latent features z from raw data
2. Sample from the model to generate new data

After training, sample new data like this:

Sample from
conditional


$$p_{\theta^*}(x \mid z^{(i)})$$

Sample z
from prior

$$p_{\theta^*}(z)$$

encoder:
estimate

$$p(z|x)$$



Variational Autoencoder

Probabilistic spin on autoencoders:

1. Learn latent features z from raw data
2. Sample from the model to generate new data

After training, sample new data like this:


Sample from
conditional

$$p_{\theta^*}(x \mid z^{(i)})$$

Sample z
from prior

$$p_{\theta^*}(z)$$

encoder:
estimate
 $p(z|x)$



Variational Autoencoder

Probabilistic spin on autoencoders:

1. Learn latent features z from raw data
2. Sample from the model to generate new data

After training, sample new data like this:


Sample from
conditional

$$p_{\theta^*}(x \mid z^{(i)})$$

Sample z
from prior

$$p_{\theta^*}(z)$$

encoder:
estimate
 $p(z|x)$



Assume simple prior $p(z)$, e.g. Gaussian.
Model encoder and decoder as NNs.

Variational Autoencoder

Probabilistic spin on autoencoders:

1. Learn latent features z from raw data
2. Sample from the model to generate new data

After training, sample new data like this:

Objective: to maximize


$$E_{z \sim q_\phi(z|x)}[\log p_\theta(x|z)] - D_{KL}(q_\phi(z|x), p(z))$$

Sample from
conditional

$$p_{\theta^*}(x | z^{(i)})$$

Sample z
from prior
 $p_{\theta^*}(z)$

encoder:
estimate
 $p(z|x)$



Assume simple prior $p(z)$, e.g. Gaussian.
Model encoder and decoder as NNs.

Variational Autoencoder

Probabilistic spin on autoencoders:


1. Learn latent features z from raw data
2. Sample from the model to generate new data

After training, sample new data like this:

Sample from
conditional
 $p_{\theta^*}(x \mid z^{(i)})$

Sample z
from prior
 $p_{\theta^*}(z)$

encoder:
estimate
 $p(z|x)$



Objective: to maximize

$$E_{z \sim q_\phi(z|x)}[\log p_\theta(x|z)] - D_{KL}(q_\phi(z|x), p(z))$$


likelihood

difference between
posterior and prior


Assume simple prior $p(z)$, e.g. Gaussian.
Model encoder and decoder as NNs.

Generation Results

32x32 CIFAR-10



Labeled Faces in the Wild




Figures from (L) Dirk Kingma et al. 2016; (R) Anders Larsen et al. 2017.

Generation Results

The diagonal prior on $p(z)$ causes dimensions of z to be independent

“Disentangling factors of variation”

Vary z_1



Latent Space Editing

The diagonal prior on $p(z)$ causes dimensions of z to be independent

“Disentangling factors of variation”

Degree of smile
Vary z_1



Head pose
Vary z_2

Latent Space Editing

The diagonal prior on $p(z)$ causes dimensions of z to be independent

“Disentangling factors of variation”

Degree of smile
Vary z_1



To make the learned representations have semantic meanings, disentanglement is important.



Head pose

Vary z_2

Latent Space Editing



Generative Adversarial Networks

- Target: obtain a model for $p(x)$, then we can sample data from it.


Generative Adversarial Networks

- Target: obtain a model for $p(x)$, then we can sample data from it.

Idea: Introduce a latent variable z with simple prior $p(z)$.

Sample $z \sim p(z)$ and pass to a **Generator Network** $x = G(z)$

Then x is a sample from the **Generator distribution** p_G . Want $p_G = p_{\text{data}}$!



Train **Generator Network** G to convert
 z into fake data x sampled from p_G


Generative Adversarial Networks

- Target: obtain a model for $p(x)$, then we can sample data from it.

Idea: Introduce a latent variable z with simple prior $p(z)$.

Sample $z \sim p(z)$ and pass to a **Generator Network** $x = G(z)$


Then x is a sample from the **Generator distribution** p_G . Want $p_G = p_{\text{data}}$!



The key idea is to train a discriminator to classify fake and real data.
A good generator should fool the discriminator to make its accuracy low:


$$p_G = p_{\text{data}}$$

Adversarial Training



$$\min_{\mathbf{G}} \max_{\mathbf{D}} \left(E_{x \sim p_{data}} [\log \mathbf{D}(x)] + E_{\mathbf{z} \sim p(\mathbf{z})} [\log (1 - \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{z})))] \right)$$


Adversarial Training



Discriminator wants
 $D(x) = 1$ for real data

$$\min_{\mathcal{G}} \max_{\mathcal{D}} \left(E_{x \sim p_{data}} [\log \mathcal{D}(x)] + E_{z \sim p(z)} [\log (1 - \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(z)))] \right)$$

Adversarial Training



Discriminator wants
 $D(x) = 1$ for real data


$$\min_G \max_D \left(E_{x \sim p_{data}} [\log D(x)] + E_{z \sim p(z)} \right)$$

Discriminator wants
 $D(x) = 0$ for fake data

$$[\log (1 - D(G(z)))]$$

Generator wants
 $D(x) = 1$ for fake data

Adversarial Training



Discriminator wants
 $D(x) = 1$ for real data

$$\min_G \max_D \left(E_{x \sim p_{data}} [\log D(x)] + E_{z \sim p(z)} \right)$$


MinMax Game between
generator and discriminator

Discriminator wants
 $D(x) = 0$ for fake data

$$[\log (1 - D(G(z)))]$$

Generator wants
 $D(x) = 1$ for fake data


Generation Results



Nearest neighbor from training set

Generation Results

Generative Adversarial Networks: DC-GAN




Radford et al, "Unsupervised Representation Learning with Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Networks", ICLR 2016

Generation Results

Generative Adversarial Networks: DC-GAN

Samples
from the
model
look
much
better!



Radford et al,
ICLR 2016

GAN's Latent Space

Generative Adversarial Networks: Interpolation


Interpolating
between
points in
latent z
space



Radford et al,
ICLR 2016


GAN's Latent Space

Generative Adversarial Networks: Vector Math




GAN's Latent Space

Generative Adversarial Networks: Vector Math




GAN's Latent Space


Generative Adversarial Networks: Vector Math



GAN's Latent Space



GAN's Latent Space



High-Resolution Generation

256 x 256 bedrooms



1024 x 1024 faces



High-Resolution Generation

512 x 384 cars




1024 x 1024 faces



Conditional GANs


We can also make GAN to generate data under given context \mathcal{Y}



Radford et al, “Unsupervised Representation Learning with Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Networks”, ICLR 2016

Conditional GANs


We can also make GAN to generate data under given context y



Radford et al, "Unsupervised Representation Learning with Deep Convolutional Generative Adversarial Networks", ICLR 2016

Text-to-Image Generation

This bird is red and brown in color, with a stubby beak




The bird is short and stubby with yellow on its body



A bird with a medium orange bill white body gray wings and webbed feet




This small black bird has a short, slightly curved bill and long legs



A picture of a very clean living room



A group of people on skis stand in the snow



Eggs fruit candy nuts and meat served on white dish



A street sign on a stoplight pole in the middle of a day



Zhang et al, "StackGAN++: Realistic Image Synthesis with Stacked Generative Adversarial Networks.", TPAMI 2018

Zhang et al, "StackGAN: Text to Photo-realistic Image Synthesis with Stacked Generative Adversarial Networks.", ICCV 2017

Reed et al, "Generative Adversarial Text-to-Image Synthesis", ICML 2016

Image-to-Image Translation





Image-to-Image Translation



Other-to-Image Translation

Label Map to Image

cloud	sky
tree	mountain
sea	grass

Input: Label Map



Semantic Manipulation Using Segmentation Map

Input:
Style
Image




Stylization using Guide Images




VQ-GAN



VQ-GAN



VQ-GAN



Text-to-Image with Diffusion Model



Sprouts in the shape of text 'Imagen' coming out of a fairytale book.



A photo of a Shiba Inu dog with a backpack riding a bike. It is wearing sunglasses and a beach hat.



A high contrast portrait of a very happy fuzzy panda dressed as a chef in a high end kitchen making dough. There is a painting of flowers on the wall behind him.



Teddy bears swimming at the Olympics 400m Butterfly event.



A cute corgi lives in a house made out of sushi.



A cute sloth holding a small treasure chest. A bright golden glow is coming from the chest.

To Achieve Higher-Level AI



- Background
- Learning from small data
- Learning to model the world
- **Joint learning of perception and reasoning**
- Take-home messages

Slides link:




<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Decision Making





- Conduct **action** in any **state** of an **environment**.




In most problems, the agent needs to do a sequence of actions w.r.t. a sequence of states.

Decision Making




- Conduct **action** in any **state** of an **environment**.




In most problems, the agent needs to do a sequence of actions w.r.t. a sequence of states.

Internal vs. External Model

Since the agent cannot fully know the external model, it should build an internal model itself for decision making.



Knowledge in Pacman



know only the positions

vs.


know the distance to the ghosts

vs.

know the high-level strategy of the
ghosts

The search agent knows the external model,
but it can make no changes or abstractions when the model is primitive.
The knowledge-based agents can benefit from the internal model
not just by covering the external model.

Knowledge in AI Systems






- Turn primitive external states into meaningful internal states.
- Reason about most useful states for decision making.
- Capture internal relationships among factors of decision making.

These reasoning rules are called knowledges in an AI system.

Knowledge Reasoning Systems

- Logic reasoning
- Probabilistic reasoning
- Causal reasoning






Currently we assume that the agents can access to
a knowledge base (facts) and a reasoning rule system
but cannot change them.

In some sense, the agents just use knowledge but cannot obtain or increase.

Knowledge Reasoning Systems

- Logic reasoning
- Probabilistic reasoning
- Causal reasoning





Currently we assume that the agents can access to
a knowledge base (facts) and a reasoning rule system
but cannot change them.

In some sense, the agents just use knowledge but cannot obtain or increase.


Logic Reasoning Systems

- Handling decision problems (true/false arguments).
- Handling discrete and (not exactly) deterministic world.




Building Blocks of Logic Systems: Syntax & Semantics

- **Syntax:** What sentences are allowed?
- **Semantics:**
 - What are the **possible worlds**?
 - Which sentences are **true** in which worlds? (i.e., **definition** of truth)




Building Blocks of Logic Systems: Syntax & Semantics

- **Syntax:** What sentences are allowed?
- **Semantics:**
 - What are the **possible worlds**? models
 - Which sentences are **true** in which worlds? (i.e., **definition** of truth)



Building Blocks of Logic Systems: Syntax & Semantics

- **Syntax:** What sentences are allowed?
- **Semantics:**
 - What are the **possible worlds**? models
 - Which sentences are **true** in which worlds? (i.e., **definition** of truth)




Syntaxland

Semanticsland

Example: $1 + 1 = 2$

Slide courtesy: Stuart Russell & Sergey Levine


The Pacman Example



Logic Inference: Entailment

- **Entailment:** $\alpha \models \beta$ (“ α entails β ” or “ β follows from α ”) iff in every world where α is true, β is also true
 - I.e., the α -worlds are a subset of the β -worlds [$\text{models}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{models}(\beta)$]
- In the example, $\alpha_2 \models \alpha_1$
- (Say α_2 is $\neg Q \wedge R \wedge S \wedge W$
 α_1 is $\neg Q$)

α_1
 α_2




Slide courtesy: Stuart Russell & Sergey Levine

Logic Inference: Entailment


- **Entailment:** $\alpha \models \beta$ (“ α entails β ” or “ β follows from α ”) iff in every world where α is true, β is also true
 - I.e., the α -worlds are a subset of the β -worlds [$\text{models}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{models}(\beta)$]
- In the example, $\alpha_2 \models \alpha_1$
- (Say α_2 is $\neg Q \wedge R \wedge S \wedge W$
 α_1 is $\neg Q$)

α_1
 α_2



Slide courtesy: Stuart Russell & Sergey Levine




Syntax vs. Semantics (Cont.)



Semantics need to have groundings in the real world.

Knowledge Reasoning Systems

- Logic reasoning
- Probabilistic reasoning
- Causal reasoning



Currently we assume that the agents can access to a knowledge base (facts) and a reasoning rule system but cannot change them.

In some sense, the agents just use knowledge but cannot obtain or increase.


Basic Tasks in Probabilistic Reasoning

- In probabilistic reasoning, we try to model the **joint distribution** of a set of random variables $P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ and do:
 - Inference: answering queries about the **marginal distributions**.
 - Conditional independence test: decide the **conditional independence** of a subset of random variables.
 - Learning: obtain the **structure** of the joint distribution.



Inference is to reasoning about the value of the variables.
The independence test and learning are to understand relationship among variables.

Graphical Models

- Graphical models represent the **joint distribution** over a set of random variables with directed or undirected graphs.
 - nodes: random variables (can be hidden or observable)
 - edges: the interaction between a pair of r.v.






Bayesian Networks & Markov Random Fields



Equivalent representation power!

Knowledge Reasoning Systems

- Logic reasoning
- Probabilistic reasoning
- Causal reasoning



Currently we assume that the agents can access to
a knowledge base (facts) and a reasoning rule system
but cannot change them.


In some sense, the agents just use knowledge but cannot obtain or increase.

Causation vs. Correlation

- Bayesian networks encode joint distributions.
- Joint distributions can be factored in different ways.
- Arrows in BNs only determine one way of factoring.

The directions of correlations can be represented in many ways.

The directions of causation is unique!



Why Causal Relationship is Important for AI?


The causal knowledge is robust against environmental changes

- Knowing whether the grass is wet changes the conditional probability


$$P(\text{rain}|\text{sprinkler}, \text{cloudy})$$

$$P(\text{rain}|\text{sprinkler}, \text{cloudy}, \text{grass} = \text{wet})$$

- But the causal relationship among sprinkler, cloudy, and rain should not change!



The Ladder of Causality



joint distributions
like BNs

causal diagrams
functional causal models

Simpson's Paradox

Treatment Stone size	Treatment A	Treatment B
Small stones	<i>Group 1</i> 93% (81/87)	<i>Group 2</i> 87% (234/270)
Large stones	<i>Group 3</i> 73% (192/263)	<i>Group 4</i> 69% (55/80)
Both	78% (273/350)	83% (289/350)

Which treatment is better? Why?


Simpson's Paradox

Treatment Stone size	Treatment A	Treatment B
Small stones	<i>Group 1</i> 93% (81/87)	<i>Group 2</i> 87% (234/270)
Large stones	<i>Group 3</i> 73% (192/263)	<i>Group 4</i> 69% (55/80)
Both	78% (273/350)	83% (289/350)

Which treatment is better? Why?

Large stones are harder, and treatment B is cheaper


Simpson's Paradox



- Similar example: air conditioner on vs. feeling hot


Discovering causal relationship should block those underlying effects on the causes!

Intervention




- The key idea is to consider the intervention $P(\text{recover}|\text{do}(\text{treatA}))$ instead of the association $P(\text{recover}|\text{treatA})$
- Common method: random controlled experiments!

Intervention



- The key idea is to consider the intervention $P(\text{recover}|\text{do}(\text{treat } A))$ instead of the association $P(\text{recover}|\text{treat } A)$
- Common method: random controlled experiments!


Intervention



- The key idea is to consider the intervention $P(\text{recover}|\text{do}(\text{treat } A))$ instead of the association $P(\text{recover}|\text{treat } A)$
- Common method: random controlled experiments!

Back-Door Criterion


Treatment Stone size	Treatment A	Treatment B
Small stones	<i>Group 1</i> 93% (81/87)	<i>Group 2</i> 87% (234/270)
Large stones	<i>Group 3</i> 73% (192/263)	<i>Group 4</i> 69% (55/80)
Both	78% (273/350)	83% (289/350)



- Experiments are not always necessary. Can infer from observations!
- Just close the “back doors” by conditioning on parent variables.
- Many interesting algorithms.

Back-Door Criterion

Treatment Stone size	Treatment A	Treatment B
Small stones	<i>Group 1</i> 93% (81/87)	<i>Group 2</i> 87% (234/270)
Large stones	<i>Group 3</i> 73% (192/263)	<i>Group 4</i> 69% (55/80)
Both	78% (273/350)	83% (289/350)



- Experiments are not always necessary. Can infer from observations!
- Just close the “back doors” by conditioning on parent variables.
- Many interesting algorithms.

Counterfactuals



Counterfactuals

Imagining

What if I had done ... ?

Why?

If the treatment was not given,
would the patient recover?

- We can not even get data to estimate!
- But they lie at heart of human intelligence.

Functional Causal Models

- We should know more than conditional probabilities: the underlying physical mechanism among causes and effects.

- Functional causal models: **unmodeled randomness**

$$\underline{x_i} = f_i(\underline{pa_i}, \underline{u_i}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

effect control
variables

- Example: $x_i = \sum_{k \neq 1} \alpha_{ik} x_k + u_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$

Counterfactuals

$$x = u_1,$$

$$y = xu_2 + (1 - x)(1 - u_2)$$

X: treatment
Y: death

Know: X=1, Y=1
Ask: whether
X=0, Y=0?

- Abduction: put the evidence into the equations:

$$u_1 = 1, u_2 = 1$$

- Action: set the new control variable:

$$x = 0$$

- prediction: get the new effect:

$$y = 0$$

Counterfactuals

$$x = u_1,$$

$$y = xu_2 + (1 - x)(1 - u_2)$$

X: treatment
Y: death

Know: X=1, Y=1
Ask: whether
X=0, Y=0?

- Abduction: put the evidence into the equations:

$$u_1 = 1, u_2 = 1$$

- Action: set the new control variable:

$$x = 0$$


- prediction: get the new effect:

$$y = 0$$

Similar to traveling in parallel universe

Joint Perception-Reasoning Learning in Computer Graphics


- Graphics: generate visual objects with semantic factors
- AI + Graphics: generate visual objects with semantic factors based on understanding humans and the world



Towards Visual Object Generation with High-Level AI

→ human design → learn from data → Inference by knowledge

Previous Traditional
Visual Object Generation




No AI
Human Programming

Current Deep Learning Aided
Visual Object Generation



Low-Level AI
Learning from Data

Future AI-Based
Visual Object Generation




High-level AI
Learning from Data &
Symbolic Inference


Bridging Simulated And Real World



I want a kitty like this but cuter



Learning Disentangled Representations with Semantic Guidance



- Disentanglement: Learning semantic factors from visual objects
- Existing methods focus on unsupervised disentanglement, e.g. VAE
- Unsupervised disentanglement cannot learn complex semantic factors for symbolic inference
 - Supervision is necessary for disentanglement [Locatello et al., 2019]
 - Make the semantic factors have symbolic groundings

To Achieve Higher-Level AI

- Background
- Learning from small data
- Learning to model the world
- Joint learning of perception and reasoning
- Take-home messages

Slides link:



<https://yaoxiangding.github.io/introML-2023/lec8-frontiers.pdf>

Learning from Small Data

- Meta-learning is learning-to-learn, to minimize the transfer risk

$$\arg \min_{\phi_0} \mathbb{E}_{P \sim \mathcal{T}, D \sim P} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim P} [L(\mathcal{A}(D, \phi_0), (x, y))] \right\}$$

- A meta-learning problem can be defined by its inner task:

Given (A), use (B) and do (C), to achieve (D)

- Optimization, non-parametric and black-box approaches can achieve good performance in few-shot learning tasks. However, the performance of fine-tune baseline is also strong.

Alternative ways for meta-learning/learning from small data?
Comparison to direct fine-tuning of large foundation models?

Learning to Model the World

- Autoencoders compress information using an encoder and recover the information with a decoder. Their major advantage is to learn good representation of data from learning to compress and decompress information.
- GANs are based on the idea of adversarial training between generator and discriminator, leading to good generation quality.
- More powerful generative models: text-to-image diffusion models.

Joint Learning of Perception and Reasoning

- Knowledge reasoning systems are used to build internal models of agents for modeling and representing the real world.
- Logic inference is the most classical method for knowledge reasoning, which deals with discrete and deterministic problems.
- Probabilistic reasoning models the real world with a joint probability distribution of random variables.
- The ladder of causal reasoning: association, intervention, and counterfactual.
- Central challenge: learn high-level reasoning knowledge and low-level perception model jointly.

Thanks for your attention! Discussions?

Acknowledgement: Many materials in this lecture are taken from

<https://sites.google.com/view/icml19metalearning>

<https://inst.eecs.berkeley.edu/~cs188/sp19/>

<https://web.eecs.umich.edu/~justincj/teaching/eecs498/FA2020/schedule.html>